

June 3, 2004

## INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TM 5285; LOG NO. 02-15-003; FOLAND TENTATIVE MAP

2. Description of Project:

The project proposes to subdivide 12.89 acres into four separate parcels ranging in size from 2.27 to 5.58 gross acres. An existing residence and access driveway on proposed lot 4 will remain. Construction activities as a result of the division will include: three housing pads with associated driveways, leach fields and fire clearing; and, an access road off Guatay View Lane to Lots 1, 2 and 3. Water service will be provided by the Guatay Water District.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Ed Foland  
P.O. Box 662  
Pine Valley, CA 91962

4. Project Location:

The project is located north of Highway 80 at 27350 Guatay View Lane in the community of Guatay, an unincorporated area of San Diego County (APN 408-110-13).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1236, Grid H/3

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

To the north and northeast of the project site are undeveloped lands. To the south are rural residential lots ranging in size from 1.5 to 3.1 acres. To the west are undeveloped land and rural residential uses. To the east are larger rural residential lots from 8 to 12 acres in size.

The site is mainly chaparral with some disturbance due to an existing single family dwelling and grading per previous discretionary action, L2704. The existing residence is located on the most northerly proposed lot (Lot 4). Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) steep slopes on Lot 4 are protected by an existing open space easement, while an oak woodland area is protected by an existing open space easement that extends across portions of Lots 1, 2, & 3.

6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Pine Valley Sponsor Group  
Land Use Designation: (1) Residential  
Density: 1 du/1,2,4 acre(s)
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: (RR1) Rural Residential  
Density: 1 du/1 acre  
Special Area Regulation: N/A
8. **Environmental resources** either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Biological Resources

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:  
  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650  
San Diego, California 92123-1666
10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:  
  
Megan Hamilton, Planner  
(858) 694-3694
11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

California Department of Fish and Game  
State Water Resources Board

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Kristin M. Blackson, Planner, DPLU  
Megan Hamilton, Planner, DPLU  
Marette Esperance, Planning Manager, DPLU  
Dag Bunnemeyer, Project Manager, DPLU  
Kenneth Brazell, Project Manager, DPW  
Edward Sinsay, Project Analyst, DPW

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

MEGAN HAMILTON, Planner  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
Regulatory Planning

June 3, 2004

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: June 3, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Foland Tentative Map

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TM 5285; LOG NO. 02-15-003

### EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

**"Potentially Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

**"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

**"Less Than Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

**"Not Applicable."** County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

### I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

#### **Additional Information Required from Applicant.**

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.5, Country Towns (CT) and General Plan Land Use Designation (1) Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 1,

2 and 4 acres, depending on the slope of the proposed parcel and not more than 1, .5 or .25 dwelling units per acre, depending on the slope of the property. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes ranging in size from 2.27 to 5.58 acres and density of .3 dwelling unit per acre. These are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Central Mountain Subregional Plan. Relevant policies of the Subregional Plan include policies intended to ensure long-term water supply and discourage those land uses that require excessive amounts of groundwater or put the purity of the groundwater at risk. The Guatay Mutual Water Co. has provided a Project Facility Availability Form which states that facilities to serve the project are available. The project complies with these policies of the Subregional Plan.

The current zone is RR1, Rural Residential Use Regulation which requires a net minimum lot size of 1 acre. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is developed with rural residential or open space uses. There is an existing residence on the most northerly proposed lot of the project site. To the north are undeveloped lands. To the south are rural residential lots ranging in size from 1.5 to 3.1 acres. To the west are undeveloped land and rural residential uses. To the east are larger rural residential lots from 8 to 12 acres in size. The proposed project is for a large lot residential land use proposing .3 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, this project will be

compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project is a major subdivision which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

The proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community because the physical arrangement of established development is one of urban [rural] uses and character. The proposed project will not require the introduction of new utilities to the area.

## **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site and adjacent parcels do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. In addition, the proposed project site does not support prime agricultural soils, as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Therefore, no adverse impacts to resources included in this program or on prime agricultural soils will occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site and surrounding area is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Immediately north of the site, land is within an agricultural preserve, however, the project site itself is not an agricultural preserve and does not currently support agricultural uses. In addition, the project site has a General Plan Designation of (1) Residential and is zoned (RR1) Rural Residential. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

### **III. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The property currently has a single-family residence on the northerly proposed lot, which is to remain. This subdivision would not displace any

amount of existing housing. Potentially a total of four single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed.

#### IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

##### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Kristin M. Blackson on May 31, 2002, did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

##### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as (BbG) Bancas stony loam. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

##### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse potential for development activity.



4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

On a site visit completed by Kristin M. Blackson on May 31, 2002, no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). Also, on a site visit conducted by Kristin M. Blackson on May 31, 2002, no past or present mining activities were identified on the project.

**V. WATER RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project lies in the Descanso hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit – although portions of the San Diego Bay are impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the Sweetwater River, which is tributary to the Bay, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the Sweetwater River watershed include coliform bacteria and trace metals.

The project is situated towards the eastern limits of the Loveland Reservoir Watershed Boundary. It is outside of the County urban area and is thus exempt from the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). However, according to the Drainage Study dated April 16, 2003, potential pollutants such as fertilizers from lawns and car wash soap liquids will be directed as surface runoff to natural areas for pollutant adsorption into the soil. No petroleum-based solvent runoff is anticipated for this project. The study also finds there will be no increased runoff impact downstream.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d).

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Guatay Mutual Water Co. has provided a Project Facility Availability Form which states that adequate facilities to serve the project are available.

4. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant.**

DPW staff has reviewed the preliminary drainage study dated April 16, 2003 and find it acceptable. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of

a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant.**

DPW staff has reviewed the preliminary drainage study dated April 16, 2003 and find it acceptable. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. It does not propose to increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project will have no adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it does not propose to impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse.

6. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

DPW staff has reviewed the preliminary drainage study dated April 16, 2003 and find it acceptable. The proposed project will not significantly impact any existing or planned stormwater drainage systems because it does not proposed to significantly increase runoff. The project will have no adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it does not propose to impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse.

7. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Descanso hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold

freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project is situated towards the eastern limits of the Loveland Reservoir Watershed Boundary. It is outside of the County urban area and is thus exempt from the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). However, according to the Drainage Study dated April 16, 2003, potential pollutants such as fertilizers from lawns and car wash soap liquids will be directed as surface runoff to natural areas for pollutant adsorption into the soil. No petroleum-based solvent runoff is anticipated for this project. The study also finds there will be no increased runoff impact downstream. Thus, the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section V, Water Resources Question 2, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

8. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

9. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

**Not Applicable.**

The project will obtain its water supply from the Guatay Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The

project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

10. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will obtain its water supply from the Guatay Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply, and will therefore not deplete groundwater supplies.

**VI. AIR QUALITY**

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 30 Average Daily Trips (ADT). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Based on a site visit conducted on May 31, 2002 by Kristin M. Blackson, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

**VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION**

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the L.O.S. of affected roadways. Old Highway 80 (SC 1883) is a Collector Road on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current L.O.S. 'A' (1,400 ADT) {threshold of 1,900 ADT for L.O.S.'B', based upon existing 2-lane road}. The traffic volume from the project (30 ADT) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increase on Old Highway 80.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not have any significant impacts on traffic safety. The project will be certified, by the private engineer, that it has adequate sight distance prior to final occupancy and that all driveways are built to County Standards. The applicant will be required to design and construct all private roads per County Private Road Standards.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not have any significant increase in the volume of traffic on Old Highway 80 or other County roads in the area. The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on Old Highway 80 or any other County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

## **VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The site contains northern mixed chaparral and coast live oak woodland that are considered sensitive habitats. One red-shouldered hawk, a California species of concern was observed onsite. There are several other species with a potential to occur onsite include the turkey vulture; mountain quail; San Diego ringneck snake; and, southern mule deer among others. No sensitive plant species were observed. Most of the coast live oak woodland is protected by an existing biological open space easement. This easement will be extended to include 0.09 acres of oak woodland and thus no impacts to this sensitive resource will occur. Additionally, it is a condition of the project that no brushing, clearing or grading will take place during the raptor breeding season (February 1 to June 1).

The project will impact 4.17 acre onsite and 0.4 acre offsite of northern mixed chaparral. To mitigate for this impact, 3.24 acre of an existing steep slope easement will be dedicated as a biological open space easement. This onsite open space proposed is connected to a large block

of undeveloped habitat offsite to the north and northeast. The amount of northern mixed chaparral protected within biological open space easements, either existing or proposed as part of this project, is 6.84 acres. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above including onsite biological open space dedication and breeding season avoidance the proposal will not result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers?

**Not Applicable.**

The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

3. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or waters of the U.S that could potentially be impacted, diverted or obstructed by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or water of the U.S in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over.

4. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project is in the Central Mountain Region and lies north of Old Highway 80 from which it is accessed. Most of the development in the area lies to the southeast of the project site. Development for this project is restricted towards the south property boundary and is adjacent to existing development. The northeast portion of the parcel that has steep



slopes and is adjacent to undeveloped lands to the north and northeast, may be appropriate for wildlife dispersal on-site. Wildlife may continue to cross the property in a southeast to northwest manner to reach native vegetation offsite because the northeast corner of the property will be placed in a biological open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Final Map, whichever comes first. Further the boundary of the open space will be permanently fenced and signed to separate the open space from the existing residence onsite. Therefore no significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors will occur.

## IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the proposal present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, or building permit process. A Fire Service Availability Letter, dated January 24, 2002, has been received from the Pine Valley Fire Protection District. Pine Valley Fire Protection District

also requires that all existing roads be upgraded to a minimum of 20 ft improved and all new roadways will be improved to 24 ft. Sprinklers will be required in all structures, turnarounds will be placed and an additional fire hydrant is required.

4. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

DPW staff has reviewed the preliminary drainage study dated April 16, 2003 and find it acceptable. The applicant will be required to show lines of inundation to the 100-year flood for the watercourses that flow through the property. Each lot shall have a flood-free building site to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego, Director of Public Works.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Not Applicable.**

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Not Applicable.**

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

**X. NOISE**

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposal would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project would not generate potentially significant adverse groundborne vibration or noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review by John Bennett.

4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review by John Bennett.

For general construction, the temporary increase over existing ambient levels is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County Noise Ordinance. The hours of construction are also restricted by the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410).

For project-related traffic, the temporary or periodic increase in noise levels going to and from the project site is not expected to exceed the 60 decibel CNEL limit of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan.

5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport.

6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

## **XI. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts:

Mountain Empire Unified School District

Pine Valley Fire Protection District

Guatay Water District

The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies.

The schools indicate that the project is eligible for service. However, the Mountain Empire Unified School District states that the project will result in overcrowding of Mountain Empire Junior High School.

The Pine Valley Fire Protection District states that emergency travel time to the project is 10-12 minutes. This is within acceptable limits set in the Public Facility Element. Clearing of 100 feet will be required around all structures. Pine Valley Fire Protection District also requires that all existing roads be upgraded to a minimum of 20 feet improved and all new roadways will be improved to 24 feet. Sprinklers will be required in all structures, turnarounds will be placed and an additional fire hydrant is required.

The project is accessed by Guatay View Lane, which is an existing private road; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

## **XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES**

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;  
Communication systems;  
Water treatment or distribution facilities;  
Sewer or septic tanks;  
Storm water drainage;  
Solid waste disposal;  
Water supplies?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. The Guatay Water Company will provide water. The project will rely on individual on-site sewage disposal systems. The Pine Valley Fire Protection District will provide Fire Protection services.

See Section XI for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

**XIII. AESTHETICS**

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of less than 15 percent gradient. The AEIS application states that less than 2 acres are to be graded with a volume of cut and fill at 4,700 cubic yards. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading. The maximum height of cut slopes is estimated to be 11 feet and the maximum height of fill slopes is estimated to be 14 feet.

3. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

**XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
  - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
  - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
  - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
  - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
  - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The staff archaeologist has reviewed project photographs, maps, and the County of San Diego archaeology/biology resource files and determined the property does not contain significant archaeological resources. In addition, the project site has completed the following survey reports for the Foland Property per previous actions on-site: "Report on Archaeological Site Files Record Search, dated April 1, 1997" and "A Cultural Resource Survey Report Form, dated May 30, 1997." Neither report found



significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site.

**XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE**

None.

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., and 4., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., and 2., the project will not degrade the quality of the environment and will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

There were no other discretionary projects within a mile of this project. To the north of this site is Forest Conservation Initiative land. Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XV of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/ Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

**XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS**

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: N/A
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A
3. Mitigation measures: N/A

**XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

'Drainage Study for Foland Property', dated April 16, 2003. Prepared by Mark Farrington

'Biological Technical Report for the Foland Property TM5285', dated September 2003. Prepared by REC Consultants

"Report on Archaeological Site Files Record Search," dated April 1, 1997. Prepared by The San Diego Museum of Man

"Cultural Resource Survey Report Form," dated May 30, 1997. Prepared by Sue A. Wade, Cultural Resource Management

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division  
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,  
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701  
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b,  
Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through  
36.437)

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300  
through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology